Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2008.

I.   Summary of Allowed Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 40 and 51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claims 10 and 26 were amended to include the allowable subject matter from claims 40 and 51.

II.   Summary of Rejections

Claims 10, 24, 26, 29-39, and 41-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,774) in view of Bodwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,951,021).

III.   Summary of Applicants' Response

The present Reply amends claims 10, 24, and 26, and cancels claims 40 and 51, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 10, 24, 26, 29-39, and 41-50. Claims 10 and 26 have been amended to include the allowable features previously found in claims 40 and 51. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

IV.   Response to Rejections

Claim 10

The present Reply amends claim 10 to include the allowable features previously found in claim 40. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 26

The present Reply amends claim 26 to include the allowable features previously found in claim 51. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is allowable.

Claim 24

Claim 24 (as amended) states:

A computer-readable medium storing instructions for processing an invocation at a dynamically generated wrapper, comprising the steps of:

receiving, from an application, a method invocation to a resource adapter;

calling a wrapper object for processing the method invocation wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated from a resource adapter class;

initiating pre-processing by the wrapper object, wherein the wrapper object calls a pre-invocation handler configured to perform server side logic, wherein the server-side logic includes transaction processing logic;

forwarding the method invocation to the resource adapter by the wrapper object on behalf of the application;

receiving a result of the method invocation from the resource adapter by the wrapper object;

initiating post-processing by the wrapper object, wherein the wrapper object calls a post-

- 10 -

invocation handler configured to perform server-side logic, wherein the server-side logic include

transaction management; and

provinding the result to the application, thereby enabling the application to access vendor

specific extension methods of the resource adapter;

wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime by a wrapper factory on an

application server.

The Office Action rejected Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Glass in view of Bodwell. Claim 24 was amended with features previously found in claim 34.

For disclosing the feature of "wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime

by a wrapper factory on an application server," the Office Action cited Bodwell col. 6, line 55 – col.

7, line 2. The cited portion of Bodwell describes dynamic generation of remote proxies. The cited

portion of Bodwell describes parsing a java file, creating a java file for a remote proxy object,

compiling, and then loading the remote proxy object. The cited portion of Bodwell does not,

however, describe "wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime by a wrapper

factory on an application server."

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 10 is

not obvious in view of Glass and Bodwell. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) rejection to claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 29-39 and 41-50

Dependent Claims 30-39 depend from Claim 10. For at least the reasons discussed above

with regards to Claim 10, dependent Claims 30-39 are also patentable. Dependent claims 30-39 add

- 11 -

their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Dependent Claims 29 and 41-50 depend from claim 26 and are also patentable for the reasons above. Dependent claims 29 and 41-50 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

V.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __August 1, 2008__   By: __/Thomas K. Plunkett/__
                                       Thomas K. Plunkett
                                       Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928